

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

JEFFREY O'QUINN,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVE RUEBHAUSEN, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 05-CV-746-DRH

ORDER

HERNDON, District Judge:

Before the Court is a motion for an extension of time filed by Plaintiff Jeffrey O'Quinn ("Plaintiff"). (Doc. 41.) Plaintiff seeks an additional, unspecified amount of time to respond to two motions to dismiss submitted by Defendants (Docs. 22, 34). (*Id.*) Notwithstanding this motion, Plaintiff also submits a "Motion of Objection" to the aforementioned motions to dismiss. (Doc. 42.) The Court is unclear as to whether this is the response Plaintiff envisages in his request for an extension of time.

On May 10, 2006 this Court entered an order providing that Plaintiff had up to and including May 30, 2006 to respond to Defendants' motions to dismiss. (Doc. 36.) This order itself allowed Plaintiff an extension of time to respond to both motions to dismiss that have been submitted by Defendants; absent the order, Plaintiff's responses would have been due on April 10, 2006 (as to Defendant Samuels's motion) and May 23, 2006 (as to Defendant Wenzel's motion).

Plaintiff now asks for an additional extension of time, despite noting that he learned of Defendants' motions on May 10, 2006. The Court cannot accede to Plaintiff's request. At the time he claims to have learned of Defendants' motions, Plaintiff had, by his own admission, three weeks to respond. Plaintiff fails to identify a single reason why this time is insufficient. Nor does he offer any suggestion of what a reasonable time would be.

For these reasons, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion. (Doc. 41.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 25th day of May, 2006.

/s/ **David RHerndon**
United States District Judge